Mantik insists that eye-witness testimony is superior to photographs. He cites an authority (second hand), Vincent Salandria, as saying this is a matter of law. But when it serves what he is making up, he insists on the exact opposite, that eye-witness testimony cannot be believed. (Marked on pp 343-4)

He also displays ignorance of both other films and other official evidence.

How does he know enough about the actual official evidence on the Z of John to say, what is "the most remarkable feature of the film."